[XXXVIIth Year.] THE [No. 1806.]

MARYLAND GAZETTE.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 1781.

To SAMUEL CHASE, Esquire.

THIS addreſs is extorted by a publication in the Maryland gazette of the 21ſt of laſt month, under the ſignature of *Cenſor*, of which I preſume you to be the author. As *the draughtſman of inſtructions alluded to* in that publication is well known to ſeveral perſons in this ſtate, and as you have charged him with being guilty of the "*unnatural and perfidious conduct of a falſe friend*," he cannot ſubmit to the imputation, and therefore feels himſelf obliged to lay before an impartial public the motive and occaſion of thoſe *offenſive* inſtructions. Before I enter on this ſubject, it is proper to premiſe, that I never knew, till I read the Cenſor, that the *draughtſman* had been called upon by you to ſupport the truth of the facts, which gave birth to the inſtructions. I ſhould not have thought it neceſſary, had I been called upon when the tranſaction was *recent*, nor do I think it *now* incumbent upon me, to prove the facts, with which you were charged by *common report*. Certain it is that a very general clamour had been raiſed againſt you, which was no ſecret to you, or your friends; and few were ignorant of the occaſion. Why was not the appeal *then* made to the public, when the circumſtances, which gave colour to the report ſo injurious to your character, were recent and known to many? Why have you delayed the appeal thus long? A man of *nice feelings and honour* would not remain a day under the imputation of *a breach of truſt*, were it in his power to convince the public of the injuſtice of the charge. Perhaps you may urge, that you did not know the authors of the injurious report; probably you did not; nor do I know the author, or authors: but was it neceſſary to know them, to clear up your character, and refute the calumny. The report, with all its attendant circumſtances, was well known to you: the knowledge of the *authors of it* was not *then* more neceſſary, than *now*; for even *now* you do not know them. Surely the appeal to the public *now* made, and the challenge thrown out (not boldly, as becomes innocence, in your own, but under a fictitious name) would have been made with much greater propriety at *that time*, than at preſent. I am not ſingular in this opinion. Mr. Holt, the printer of the New-York journal informed you by letter publiſhed in his paper of the 25th of January 1781, in anſwer to one he had received from you, that he could not agree with you in opinion, that the name of the author of the pieces ſigned Publius (A) was at all neceſſary to your vindication, which might as well be effected without, as with it. *The charge* (continues Mr. Holt) *is plainly expreſſed, and if Mr. Chaſe proves it to be groundleſs and unjuſt, his character will be perfectly clear'd without his being acquainted with the name of his accuſer.*

Mr. Holt's obſervation is pointedly juſt; and if you were really innocent, and could then have cleared up your character ſatisfactorily, you were much to blame in not following his advice, but ſuffering yourſelf to remain three years under the imputation, which your very ſilence confirmed.

This by way of digreſſion; I return to the inſtructions.

When the aſſembly met at Annapolis in October 1778, on my repairing thither from the country, I found ſeveral gentlemen warm in their complaints againſt *you*, as well as upon ſome *other points*, in which, they conceived this ſtate had been materially wronged. I obſerved, that public perſons ſhould expreſs their opinions publicly, and not waſte time in fruitleſs and obſcure complaints; that if they ſuſpected any practices were carried on injurious to the ſtates in general, or to this in particular, by any man, or body of men, they ought to prevent, if poſſible, the future commiſſion of ſuch practices, by inſtructions to their delegates in congreſs, and by thus expoſing their grievances, obtain redreſs, if obtainable. This obſervation occaſioned the appointment of a committee in the ſenate to draw up inſtructions; I was choſen of the number, and deſired to draw them, in compliance with my duty, as a public man, I drew a ſet of inſtructions conformable to the ideas, which had been thrown out in the courſe of converſation; they were ſubmitted to the conſideration and correction of a joint committee of both houſes; and, after ſome alterations, were reported to the houſe of delegates. The inſtructions reported, were as much the act of the *whole committee*, who approved them, as of the perſon who drew them. I was under no obligation to acquaint you with them, or their tendency. You knew what had been publicly reported of your having divulged to your partners in trade the intended purchaſe of flour; the general voice, your ſilence, and the occurrences at that time much ſpoken of, and now ſtrengthened by the extracts of letters contained in one of the notes, lead me to ſuſpect (and the ſuſpicion is not yet removed) that you were guilty. I ſay, Sir, my ſuſpicion is not yet removed; in good truth, what have you alleged to prove your innocence, but mere proteſtations? and may there not be ſome circumſtances, indicating and confirming guilt, which outweigh the ſtrongeſt proteſtations of innocence? as for inſtance the following: A member of congreſs, Mr. Merchant, complained publicly in congreſs, that the ſecret, reſpecting the purchaſe of flour, had been betrayed by the delegates of Maryland. Yourſelf, Mr. Plater, and Mr. Forbes, were preſent; the laſt mentioned gentlemen roſe, and declared *they* had not divulged the ſecret; you were ſilent on this occaſion, *you* who are ſo apt to be declamatory on moſt others. When you heard the accuſation, and the declarations of Meſſ Plater and Forbes, why, if innocent, were you ſilent? Did you not afterwards, out of congreſs, relate to ſome member, or members, of that body, that you could account for the divulging of the ſecret? Did you not mention to that member, that Mr. William Smith of Baltimore-town, had opened a letter from you to the governor and council, by which he came to the knowledge of the intended purchaſe, and that thus it had tranſpired? Did you not, when taxed with this piece of ingenuity by Mr. Smith, or one of his ſons, deny you had ever invented it (B). To the above circumſtance, tending to eſtabliſh your guilt, the following gives additional weight. About the latter end of July, or firſt of Auguſt 1778, (the preciſe time cannot at this diſtance be accurately aſcertained) ſeveral perſons began to purchaſe rye, wheat, and flour; in conſequence of ſo many purchaſers employed in different parts of the country, rye and wheat roſe from 10ſ per buſhel (the price in Auguſt) to 12/6, 25ſ. and 30ſ per buſhel by the 20th of September, and by the 1ſt of February 1779 the price had riſen to 65ſ. Moſt of the purchaſers, if not all, were commiſſioned, as was reported and believed at the time, by Mr. John Dorſey, one of your partners in trade. Poſſibly, ſome time after, others became competitors in the purchaſe; but the *firſt* purchaſers were Mr. Dorſey's agents. Does not this circumſtance ſtrongly indicate, that he had been previouſly informed by *you*, that wheat, rye, and flour would be the moſt profitable articles to ſpeculate in? Poſſibly, you did not in direct and explicit terms inform Mr. Dorſey of the purchaſes intended to be made by the public; but he knowing you to be well acquainted with the wants of the army, and the ſecrets of congreſs, would have been dull indeed had he not taken an imperfect hint, and improved it to the advantage of the company. That Mr. Dorſey purchaſed about that time a conſiderable quantity of wheat and flour you will not deny, or that hearing the complaints of the commiſſary general, and the clamour excited againſt your conduct, you ſold to Mr. Wadſworth, or his deputy, at double price, the wheat and flour, which had been purchaſed by your partners. It is painful to deſcend to theſe particulars, but if they are brought back to public memory, reflect that you are the cauſe.

But theſe facts, even if true, you may ſay are but *circumſtances*, not *proofs* of guilt. Although they may not amount to legal proof, yet were they in mine, and the opinions of others, ſufficient to induce a belief, that the public report was too well founded; and ſuch a belief, grounded on ſuch circumſtances, was ſufficient as I, and many others conceived, to warrant the inſtructions complained of. Nothing but the letter written to your partners, or the oath of a credible witneſs, or witneſſes, that they had ſeen ſuch a letter divulging the deſign of congreſs, and adviſing the purchaſe, or your, or their acknowledgment of the fact, would, I ſuppoſe, be admitted in a court of law as ſimple and proper proof of the charge. It is not probable, that ſuch proof can be procured, or that any man will criminate himſelf.

But if any members of the legiſlature were impreſſed with a belief, originating from the above mentioned circumſtances, or from others not known to me, that you were really guilty of a breach of truſt, and that ſuch practices would injure the public, were they to wait and ſuffer in the mean time the continuance of ſimilar frauds, until the authors of them could be legally convicted? Surely, Sir, you who upon many occaſions have ſhewn ſo much

"*You appeared to me to have been abuſed, and yet I was not ſo clear in the fact, as to authoriſe me to write names. In converſation with Mr Forbes, he informed me lately who ſaid you had opened the letter, and circulated the contents; this gentleman is now going to Baltimore, and will be ſo polite as to take charge of my letter, to him therefore I beg leave to refer you. Believe me Sir, from the firſt moment I heard the intimation alluded to, I treated it not only with diſcredit, but indignation, and expreſſed my feelings in the very inſtant to a particular friend. I know, ſaid I, Mr. Smith's honour and his diſcretion are never ſo unguarded, as this imputation ſeems to imply.*"

I am authoriſed to ſay, that Mr Forbes made no ſcruple to declare, at Mr. Smith's table, that Mr. Chaſe was the member of congreſs who ſaid Mr. Smith had opened his letter to the governor and council and betrayed the ſecret intended only for their information. Mr. Smith feeling the injuſtice done him by this inſinuation applied to Mr Chaſe, who declared in the moſt ſolemn manner the whole was without the leaſt foundation in truth and that he would, if deſired, give from under his hand to that purpoſe, with permiſſion to publiſh the ſame in the different gazettes. Thus we have the teſtimony of the late Mr Forbes, a gentleman of character and veracity that Mr. Chaſe ſaid Mr. Smith had opened his letter to the governor and council by which the ſecret tranſpired: we have only Mr. Chaſe's denial of the allegation, and Mr. Forbes being dead he cannot ſupport it. Who is to be believed, the man intereſted in denying the accuſation, or he, who had no intereſt in making it?

(A) *The author of three letters addreſſed to Samuel Chaſe, Eſq; and printed in the New-York Journal, publiſhed by Mr. Holt at Poughkeepſie. The following paſſage is taken from the ſecond letter:* "*When you reſolved to avail yourſelf of the extraordinary demand for flour, which the wants of the French fleet muſt produce, and which your official ſituation early impreſſed upon your attention—to form connections for monopoliſing that article, and raiſing the price upon the public more than a hundred per cent.—when by your intrigues and ſtudied delays you protracted the determination of the committee of congreſs on the propoſals made by Mr. Wadſworth, commiſſary-general for procuring the neceſſary ſupplies for the public uſe—to give your agents time to complete their purchaſes—I ſay, when you were doing all this, and engaging in a traffic infamous in itſelf, repugnant to your ſtation, and ruinous to your country, did you pauſe, and allow yourſelf a moment's reflection on the conſequences? Were you infatuated enough to imagine you would be able to conceal the part you were acting? Or had you conceived a thorough contempt of reputation, and a total indifference to the opinion of the world?*" *I have quoted this paſſage to ſhew, that the charge made againſt Mr. Chaſe, by Publius, is not of that vague, indeterminate, and general nature, which to be diſcredited, needs only to be denied. The charge is pointedly made, the time, the nature of the offence, circumſtances, and ſeveral perſons, are mentioned, or plainly alluded to. The gentlemen who compoſed the committee of congreſs, and Mr. Wadſworth the commiſſary-general, were well known. Mr. Chaſe might have called upon the committee, and Mr. Wadſworth, to vouch, that he had not, either by his intrigues, or ſtudied delays, protracted the determination of the committee, to give his friends time to complete their purchaſes.*" *He might have called upon Publius to prove, that wheat and flour had been purchaſed by his partners* at that particular point of time; *and if no ſuch purchaſes were then made, he might have evinced, beyond the poſſibility of doubt, that the accuſation was groundleſs, and founded in malice or miſinformation. Why Mr. Chaſe did not take theſe ſteps, if innocent, is inconceivable, particularly after the peace of friendly advice given him by Mr. Holt.*

(B) *Extract from the letter of the honourable Henry Laurens preſident of congreſs, to Mr. William Smith, dated September 22, 1778.*

"*It has been acknowledged that a member of congreſs did give the information reſpecting the exportation of flour to the eaſtern ſtates, intending it only for the private information of the governor and council, but that you, my good friend, opened the letter, and let the contents paſs under the eyes of ſeveral merchants, and others.*"

Mr. Smith juſtly offended at this report, wrote to the preſident denying the charge, and requeſting his letter to be read in congreſs, which the preſident anſwered on the 4th of October 1778; the following extract is taken from the laſt mentioned letter.

diſtruſt of public characters, and in one inſtance publicly criminated gentlemen of known integrity, on light ſurmiſes, or falſe information, will not pretend to juſtify this doctrine. The public truſtees ſhould be quick ſighted, and cautious; for although *obſcure reports, artfully calculated to injure the characters of individuals*, deſerve no notice, yet their duty obliges them not to overlook reports openly circulated, and ſtrengthened by ſuch circumſtances, as might gain credit even with the moſt unſuſpicious.

From the foregoing you will readily perceive the reaſon of my not imparting to you the inſtructions, I had drawn up, before they were ſubmitted to the committee. I really ſuſ
lated to your prejudice, t
to notice, and cenſure t
you were ſo publicly rep
have been imputed to p
reſentment; neither I a
deter me from a faithful
and truſt. Beſides, a c
of the inſtructions proba
ſtrued by you into an i
might have ſuſpected t
named) was rather ſtruck

As you have thought
friendſhip, permit me, S
menced, and how it has

A ſimilarity of ſenti
firſt gave riſe to our acq
grew into familiarity an
own your public charact
me decided and for a lon
had great merit in hel
tion; you oppoſed pop
zard, nay, with the l
time; though your tale
take the lead in a dem
deſpiſe the precarious
of that form of governm
and courage enough t
oppoſition of thoſe, wh
be more democratical.

Your firſt deviation
(perhaps of rectitude,
intereſt) was your advi
ſolve of congreſs recom
to make the continental
in all caſes. But to ſpe
your conduct at the tim
and to an impetuoſity o
vents you from exami
tience of thought, ſo re
ment in all caſes of mor
ſo much ſagacity, as to
leſs frauds ſince commi
nor the intention to
temptation was too ſtr
quel. When the injuſ
law to remain in force,
pretext for its paſſage
oppoſed its repeal. H
able advantages of th
away more monies th
it? but admit, that
your payments; the fo
your own concurrence,
to perſons unwilling t
to them, and oppoſed
Will the commiſſion o
ſimilar commiſſions in
ſtrumental in produci
committed, eſpecially
and foreſight of the
point to your conſidera

You have aſſerted, t
the repeal of the ten
particular caſes. Was
caſes provided for by
to the ſenate, and was
the ſenate? From the
alluded to, you ſeem t
repealing law: yet, in
to be reconciled with j
them my ſanction by a
I foreſaw the repeal co
terms, during war, c
riety of contrary and
ſtop the increaſing evil
ing a material point;
wards juſtice, though
time, I thought, pave
and complete ſyſtem of equity.

Thus, Sir, you perceive, that although I acquit you of a ſiniſter intention, when you adviſed the reſolve of congreſs recommending the tender law, yet I cannot carry my charity ſo far, as to believe you equally blameleſs in the ſubſequent part of your conduct, reſpecting that law. A deviation from rectitude in one inſtance, gives room to ſuſpect a deviation in another, and makes the imputed breach of truſt the more probable. What ſtrengthened my ſuſpicion ſtill more was a report, at the time pretty current, that Mr. Wadſworth the commiſſary-general had complained loudly in Annapolis of your proceeding: I heard this circumſtance from ſeveral, but not expecting to be called upon three years after the tranſaction, I did not minute down the names of my informers.

Differing thus in our ideas of juſtice, impreſſed as I then was, and ſtill am, with a belief, that you had been guilty of a breach of public truſt, is it ſurpriſing that the good opinion, I once entertained of your public character and principles, changed into a very contrary ſentiment?

Thus have I accounted for the commencement, and diſſolution of our friendſhip. I am not con-

SUPPLEMENT to the MARYLAND GAZETTE.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 1781.

ANNAPOLIS, *Auguſt* 23.

LETTERS from lord Cornwallis to lord G. Germaine, relative to the action of Guilford, and his operations from "*the unfortunate affair of the 17th of January*" to that engagement, have been *reprinted* in the Pennſylvania papers, and we ſincerely wiſh we could give them *entire* to our readers, but their length, and a variety of other materials, obliges us to confine ourſelves to ſome of the *leading traits*. To give a tolerable idea of the compoſition, it may be ſufficient to obſerve, that like all the official information of Britiſh commanders ſince the preſent war, it is replete with *falſe colourings*, calculated to extol the *fortitude* and *heroiſm* of Britons, to diminiſh *their* loſſes, extenuate *their* cruelties and diſgrace, and to inſpire adminiſtration with deluſive hopes of conqueſt, by exaggerating *our* loſſes, and endeavouring to leſſen our military reputation. There was an æra of the Britiſh hiſtory, when *her* generals would have ſooner ſigned their own death warrants, than ſanctioned a falſhood by *their* ſignature; but their conduct at this day proves, that the moment a nation engages in the baſe attempt of enſlaving others, they loſe all ſenſe of public virtue or *private* honour; the *patriot* and the *gentleman are* baniſhed by the reign of deſpotiſm!

We ſubjoin a liſt of the Britiſh loſs in the action of Guilford, and *their* loſs on their march through North-Carolina, but cannot *believe* it authentic. It is certain, that both the light troops of general Greene's army and colonels Lee's and Waſhington's horſe, gained ſeveral conſiderable advantages over Tarleton, in which he loſt *many* in killed, wounded, and taken priſoners, but *theſe* his lordſhip by the *magic* of his pen, has converted into victories without bloodſhed. Once in particular col. Lee took a lieutenant and 20 men of the Britiſh legion and killed ſeveral; of this no mention is made.

Return of the killed and wounded, on the march through North-Carolina in the various actions preceding that of Guilford.

One lieutenant-colonel, 11 rank and file killed; 2 captain, 2 lieutenant, 7 ſergeants, 79 rank and file wounded.

JAMES DESPARD. dep. adj. gen.

Return of the killed, wounded, and miſſing, of the troops under the command of lieutenant general earl Cornwallis in the action of Guilford, March 15, 1781.

One lieutenant-colonel, 2 lieutenants, 2 enſigns, 13 ſergeants, 75 rank and file killed; 2 brigadier-generals, 2 lieutenant-colonels, 9 captains, 4 lieutenants, 5 enſigns, 2 ſtaff officers, 15 ſergeants, 5 drummers, 369 rank and file wounded; 2 ſergeant, 25 rank and file miſſing.

Officers names killed and wounded.

Royal artillery; lieutenant O'Hara killed. Brigade of guards; hon. lieutenant-colonel Steuart killed; brigadier-generals O'Hara and Howard, and captain Swanton, wounded; captains Schutz, Maynard, and Goodricke, wounded, and ſince dead; captains lord Dungglaſs and Maitland, enſign Stuart, and adjutant Colquhin, wounded. 23d foot; ſecond lieutenant Robinſon killed; capt. Peter wounded. 33d foot; enſign Talbot killed; lieutenant-colonel Webſter (ſince dead), lieutenants Salvin, Wynyard, enſigns Kelly, Gera, and Hughes, and adjutant Fox, wounded. 71ſt; enſign Grant killed. Regiment of Boſe; captains Wilminſkey (ſince dead), Eightenbrodt, lieutenants Schewener, and Gaiſe, enſign d'Arrot (ſince dead), wounded. Britiſh legion; lieutenant colonel Tarleton wounded.

J. DESPARD, dep. adj. gen.

THERE is at the plantation of Robert Wheeler, in Prince-George's county, taken up as a ſtray, a ſmall light iron gray horſe, 13 hands high, paces, trots, and gallops, and is about 12 or 13 years old, has a blind brand on the near buttock which cannot be readily made out. The owner may have him again on proving his property and paying charges. 16 3w

---

Office for the preſervation and ſale of forfeited eſtates, Annapolis, July 5, 1781.

To be SOLD at AUCTION, on Saturday the 25th of Auguſt next,

THE real and perſonal eſtate, late the property of Daniel Dulany of Daniel, in the city of Annapolis, of which the following lots appear to be part, viz. 13, 14, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 64, 87, 88; the two laſt are leaſed out. On one of the lots ſtands that commodious and finely ſituated dwelling houſe in which Mr. Taſker formerly lived, with other buildings. Amongſt the perſonal property are eleven valuable negroes, conſiſting of men, women, and children. The money to be paid down, if agreeable to the purchaſers; if not, they may give bond, with ſecurity, to pay one third of the ſum bid on the 1ſt of September 1782, another third on the 1ſt of September 1783, and the remaining third on the 1ſt of September, 1784, with intereſt, in gold or ſilver, or the new bills of credit to be emitted in purſuance of an act of the laſt ſeſſion, at their actual value at the time of payment.

By order, 4 JO. BAXTER, clk.

TAKEN up by Samuel Moſs, on the 12th of Auguſt, inſt. on Keely's point, near the mouth of Severn, a batteau, about 16 feet long, 5 feet and a half wide, has a ring-bolt in her head, and is rowed with four oars. The owner may have her again on proving property and paying charges. 2 w3

ALL perſons having claims againſt the eſtate of William Iliams, ſon of George, are deſired to bring them in legally proved; and thoſe who are indebted to ſaid eſtate are requeſted to diſcharge the ſame immediately.

2 WILLIAM WELSH, JOHN ILIAMS, ſen. } admrs.

---

on the 15th ult. an American party came down to the quarter houſe, 6 miles from Charles-town, where they attacked and took ſeveral dragoons, and purſued the reſt with a number of officers and others, who were on a frolic, to governor Gal within three miles of the enemy's works; that lor Rawdon lay ſo very ill at Charles-town that h life was deſpaired of, and that general Gold had th command.

A flag a few days ago fell in with the Caryſfor frigate, on board of which was gen. Leſlie, bou from Cheſapeake for Charles-town, ſuppoſed t take the command there.

---

is deſired to prove his property, pay charges, a take him away. 16 3w

---

Annapolis, June 18, 1781.

THE office in this city for taking ſubſcriptio to the NATIONAL BANK, FOR THE UNIT STATES OF AMERICA, is now opened at the loa office.

6 THOMAS HA OOD, CHARLES WA E.

[*See the ſupplement.*]

ANNAPOLIS: Printed by FREDERICK and SAMUEL GREEN, at the POST-OFFICE, Charles-Street.